UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,973	11/21/2003	Jacob Lahijani	FL0214USNA	3574

23906 7590 09/15/2010

E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1122B
4417 LANCASTER PIKE
WILMINGTON, DE 19805

EXAMINER	
VETERE, ROBERT A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1712	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner's Comments

An after-final amendment, amending claims 8 and 16, was received and entered on 8/11/10.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 8-9, 16 and 28-30 are allowed for the reasons given in the Office Action of 5/11/2010.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/11/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first argues that it would not have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Buckmaster into the method of Kazumi because Kazumi already teaches that no bubbles remain in the PFA. This is not persuasive. As stated in the previous action, Buckmaster teaches that the fluorine stabilization reduces the evolution of volatiles during further use of the film. It is not merely incorporated as a means of teaching bubble reduction. Thus, the incorporation of Buckmaster's teaching to provide a fluorine stabilization treatment into Kazumi would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because such a fluorine treatment would have reduced the evolution of volatiles during further use of the film. Additionally, a claimed invention is likely to be obvious if it is a combination of known prior art elements that would reasonably have been expected to maintain their respective properties or functions after they have been combined.

Applicant next argues that, because Kazumi and Buckmaster together fail to expressly state a peel strength of at least 25 lb/in, these references fail to render claim 6 obvious. This is not persuasive. Kazumi and Buckmaster, while failing to expressly state any specific peel strength, teach the same method using the same components as those taught by applicant. Therefore, it is inherent in the combined method of Kazumi and Buckmaster that the film has a peel strength of at least 25 lb/in. This is true regardless of whether Kazumi expressly states a desire to form an adherent lining.

Applicant further argues that Kazumi fails to teach the same additives in the same amounts as those claimed by applicant. This is not persuasive. Applicant's claim weight concentrations of metal powder of less than 2% and Kazumi teaches weight concentrations of metal powder of 0.1-30%. Applicant has pointed to examples in the specification which show a relationship between metal content

and peel strength at pp. 8-9 of the arguments. However, most of these examples only show the affect on peel strength at concentrations below 2%, where all peel strengths would meet the desired limitation of 25 lb/in. Only one example, with one metal, shows results at a metal powder content higher than 2%. A showing which is commensurate in scope with the claims would be required for a finding of unexpected results in this case.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT VETERE whose telephone number is (571)270-1864. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on 571-272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert Vetere/
Examiner, Art Unit 1712

/Michael Cleveland/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1712